

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated May 29, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the present claim amendments is found at various places in the Specification as originally filed. For example, such support is found on page 8 of the Specification, and in step 208 of Fig. 2A.

At paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 14 for informalities. Claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice or dedication herein.

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner requested a rewording of claim 6. Amendments to Claim 6 herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner requested correction of Claim 19. Amendments to Claim 19 herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 8-9, the Examiner rejected claim 14 for non-statutory subject matter. Claim 14 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or dedication.

At paragraphs 10-11 the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by the Lennox reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Lennox discloses client side includes in which Javascript references an outside JavaScript file that is used to write HTML into a document. Nowhere in Lennox is there disclosed or suggested any method or system for loading a markup language document, including:

receiving said document comprising a plurality of tags, at least one of said tags being a custom tag;
parsing said document to determine if certain of said plurality is said custom tag, *wherein said parsing includes scanning a document object model (DOM) representation of said document for the presence of said custom tag*;
inserting executable instructions into said document at a location of said custom tag, if said custom tag is present, *wherein said inserting includes modifying said DOM representation of said document to include said executable instructions in place of said custom tag*;
executing said instructions; and
rendering said document on a display device. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Analogous features are also present in the other remaining independent claims. Lennox discloses nothing about processing a DOM representation of a document in order to identify and/or replace a detected custom tag within the DOM with machine-executable instructions, as in the present independent claims. Moreover, Lennox includes no mention of processing a DOM representation of a document, or of modifying a DOM representation of a document in any way.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that Lennox does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. Accordingly, Lennox does not anticipate the present independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 102. As to the remaining dependent claims, they are respectfully believed to be patentable over Lennox for at least the same reasons.

Applicants have cancelled some claims from further consideration in this application, and have amended the independent claims. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the cancelled or unamended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the cancelled or unamended claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 28, 2007
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 303606.3000-100 (260-134)